

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Status of Claims

Claims 1-56 have been canceled.

New claims 57-112 have been added.

As such, claims 57-112 are currently pending in this application.

Applicant hereby requests further examination and reconsideration of the presently claimed application.

Examiners' Interview

Applicants thank Examiners Ren Yan and Marvin Crenshaw for the courtesy of a personal interview on August 24, 2005 with Applicants' attorney, Michael Piper, wherein the pending claims and the prior art of record were discussed. As background, Applicants explained during the interview that the prior art anti-marking systems require that at the time of installation on of the anti-marking system on the transfer cylinder, a pressman must properly align and install the flexible jacket covering relative to the cylinder base cover such that a desired amount of movement of the flexible jacket covering relative to the cylinder base cover is provided. Properly aligning and attaching the flexible jacket covering relative to the cylinder base cover to achieve the proper amount of movement relative thereto can be a time consuming task that requires training and careful attention to perform properly.

In contrast to a two-component system of the prior art that requires proper alignment of the components by the customer at the time of installation on the printing press, Applicants provided to the Examiners for inspection a commercial sample of an anti-marking cover as disclosed in the present application. Applicants explained and the Examiners seemed receptive to the notion that Applicants' anti-marking cover solved the on-site installation problem

described above by providing a customer with an anti-marking cover that does not require any adjustment of the flexible jacket covering relative to the cylinder base cover during installation. More specifically, as delivered to the customer, Applicants' anti-marking cover provides for a fixed amount of movement of the flexible jacket covering relative to the cylinder base covering, which is recited in independent claims 57, 72, 76, 77, 88, and 98. Applicants may provide a fixed amount of movement by positioning the flexible jacket covering relative to the cylinder base cover and attaching the two components wherein the attaching is not a releasable attaching, which is recited in independent claims 72, 77, and 111.

As was discussed, the term not a releasable attaching refers to the opposite of a releasable attaching, as such term would be understood to a person of skill in the art of anti-marking covers for transfer cylinders in a printing press. For example, the term not a releasable attaching is in contrast to releasable attaching such as Velcro, snaps, tack adhesive, etc. which are quickly and efficiently undone and redone without significant damage or risk of damage to the attached items. As indicated by the Examiners, in theory any attaching could be "released" with sufficient time, effort, and force ... stitching could be undone or torn out, welds could be cut, rivets could be drilled out, "krazy glue" could be dissolved and undone with the right solvents and force, but none of these would be commonly understood in everyday parlance or in the art as "releasable" means of attachment.

With this understanding, a preferred example of an attaching which is not a releasable attaching is stitching, which is recited in independent claims 57, 76, 88, and 98. In a specific embodiment represented by the commercial sample shown to the Examiners, the cylinder base cover may comprise a film, which is recited in independent claim 88. Even more than some of the other forms of cylinder base cover disclosed, a film as disclosed in the application which has

been penetrated by a stitching process does not have the resilience to easily recover from multiple stitchings and unstitchings as suggested by the Examiners. Applicants further present independent claims 78 and 81 that recite in detail methods for manufacturing anti-marking covers of the present invention. Applicants respectfully submit that the pending claims overcome a significant problem in the prior art and are patentable in view of same.

CONCLUSION

Consideration of the foregoing amendments and remarks, reconsideration of the application, and withdrawal of the rejections and objections is respectfully requested by Applicants. No new matter is introduced by way of the amendment. It is believed that each ground of rejection raised in the Final Office Action dated June 16, 2005 has been fully addressed. If any fee is due as a result of the filing of this paper, please appropriately charge such fee to Deposit Account Number 50-1515 of Conley Rose, P.C., Texas. If a petition for extension of time is necessary in order for this paper to be deemed timely filed, please consider this a petition therefore.

If a telephone conference would facilitate the resolution of any issue or expedite the prosecution of the application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the telephone number given below.

Respectfully submitted,

CONLEY ROSE, P.C.

Date: 9-15-2005

5700 Granite Parkway, Suite 330
Plano, Texas 75024
Telephone: (972) 731-2288
Facsimile: (972) 731-2289



Michael W. Piper
Reg. No. 39,800

ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANTS